



REQUEST FOR ASSISTANCE (RFA) FORM INTAKE INTERVIEW LOG

Date: 4/16/18	Interviewer: Lafayette Baker	RFA #18 – 46
Name of Person(s) Requesting Assistance: [REDACTED]		
Contact Numbers (telephone, e-mail, etc.): [REDACTED]		
Status of Person(s) Interviewed (title, position, student status, etc.): Student		
Requested Assistance Pertaining To (name, position, policy, project, etc.): DRS		

To the best of your knowledge, please fill out the following:

Interviewee Status: Male ☐ Female XX☒ Administrator ☐ Faculty ☐ Staff ☐
Student ☐

Concern Regarding: Male ☐ Female ☐ Administrator XX☒ Faculty ☐ Staff ☐
Student ☐

Category: *(Please check at least one)*

- | | | | | |
|--|---|--|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Age | <input type="checkbox"/> Color | <input type="checkbox"/> Creed | <input type="checkbox"/> XX
Disability | <input type="checkbox"/> Veteran
Status |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Marital
Status | <input type="checkbox"/> National
Origin | <input type="checkbox"/> Race | <input type="checkbox"/> Religion | <input type="checkbox"/> Retaliation |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Sex/Gender | <input type="checkbox"/> Sexual
Harassment | <input type="checkbox"/> Sexual
Orientation | <input type="checkbox"/> Employment | <input type="checkbox"/> Genetic
Information |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Gender Identity or Expression | | | | |

Time Line		
Date	Item	Comments
4/16/18	[REDACTED] called the EO Office requesting to speak to LB.	
4/23/18	LB met [REDACTED] [REDACTED]	LB explains the EO Office Resolution processes including differences between the informal resolution process and filing a formal discrimination complaint. LB also discusses the Office's limits on confidentiality (including the Public Records Act) and the prohibition against retaliation, as well as resources and reporting options. [REDACTED] indicated they did not want to file a

		<p>formal complaint and that they wanted an informal resolution.</p> <p>█████ explained that they started using the DRS two years ago, fall 2016 for ██████. DRS indicated that ██████ needed documentation which was provided. ██████ started working with their DRS Advisor Kim Thiessen. One of the accommodations was flexibility with assignment deadlines. Which allowed ██████ not be penalized if the delay was connected to ██████ disability.</p> <p>Fall 2017, that accommodation no longer showed up on ██████ DRS. The only thing ██████ had was flexibility for short turn around assignments and in-class assignments. ██████ met with Kim to understand why ██████ got the accommodation changed. ██████ interpreted it to mean that it only applied to assignments that were not on the syllabus from the beginning. It seemed more restricted. Only assignment that ██████ got the same day in class were eligible for extensions. Anyone who had that accommodation now gets this new accommodation. The change was not directly for ██████.</p> <p>█████ met with ██████, and he said the word flexibility was too vague for their office to make sure that it was being implemented by professors. ██████ asked him if they could get extensions on assignment deadlines for up to one week. And he said he did not understand why ██████ needed that accommodation, and why the nature of ██████ disability required that.</p> <p>█████ asked ██████ to further explain how ██████ disability affected ██████. At that point in the conversation, ██████ became frustrated and did not want to provide additional information at that point because ██████ felt ██████ would use the information to not provide the accommodation for ██████ instead of supporting ██████ accommodation.</p> <p>█████ told ██████ he did not want to make ██████ answer anything ██████ did not want to. But If ██████ did not answer the questions, there was no way to move further with the conversation. ██████ felt that they had to answer the questions, or ██████ would not get the help they needed. ██████ asked ██████ if ██████ wanted to continue with the conversation, and ██████ told him they would reach out to him if ██████ thought they could have a productive conversation.</p> <p>█████ later spoke to ██████ (a support person), and ██████ suggested that they come up with a specific accommodations, with clear language. They came up with accommodations which ██████ emailed to ██████. He sent an email response indicating that he does not have enough documentation. He denied it, and ██████ does not understand why.</p>
--	--	---

		<p>████ said █████ referred to █████ disability as their health multiple times which █████ believes is a misuse of the language. █████ believes it is unacceptable to refer to one aspect of them as their entire health.</p> <p>████ wants to understand why their accommodation request was denied. Also, █████ wants to know why █████ is requesting additional information for this accommodation, but not additional information for █████ prior accommodations. █████ said it seems like █████ does not understand what █████ is. █████ said it seems like █████ has not done any research to better understand █████ since █████ first talked to him. █████ said it seems like █████ is asking █████ to teach him about █████, which is unfair and frustrating.</p>
4/25/18	LB and SGS met with █████	<p>LB explains the Discrimination Complaint Procedure including differences between the informal and formal process. LB also discusses the Office's limits on confidentiality (including the Public Records Act) and the prohibition against retaliation, as well as resources and reporting options.</p> <p>████ explained that he met with █████ and he explained to █████ the reason as to why █████ prior accommodation was changed. He indicated that the word "flexibility" that was in the previous accommodation was too vague for their office to enforce with professors. █████ also said he reviewed the new accommodation that █████ proposed, and he needs more information from █████ to understand the reasons as to why █████ needs the new proposed accommodations.</p> <p>████ explained that █████ indicated that █████ was not comfortable providing additional information. SGS told █████ she would have LB schedule a follow-up meeting with █████, so Sue and LB can better understand █████ concerns.</p>
4/26/18	LB called █████	Scheduled a 5/7 meeting with █████ and SGS
5/7/18	LB and SGS met with █████ and support person █████	<p>SGS and LB explained to █████ that they met with █████ regarding █████ concerns. And █████ indicated that he needed more information from █████ doctor. They explained that during the "interactive process," █████ and their DRS advisor are supposed to work on developing an accommodation for █████</p> <p>████ explained that they had that interactive process when they received their original accommodations that worked very well for █████ However, after they changed █████ accommodation, █████ was not comfortable with the subsequent "interactive process" because █████ requested more information from █████ Doctor. █████ explained that their doctor is in █████, and █████ has not seen their doctor since they were 17. █████ said it</p>

		<p>was be very stressful and challenging to contact their doctor and get more information. [REDACTED] also believes it not right to require them to provide additional information</p> <p>[REDACTED] explained that they already had the accommodations that worked for them. And the key issue is long reading assignments over 15 pages. [REDACTED] said that triggers their [REDACTED]. They explained that the reading assignment are cumulative. Therefore, [REDACTED] cannot read ahead. [REDACTED] needs the accommodation to help with reading intensive classes.</p> <p>[REDACTED] then became emotional because they did not believe it was fair for them to have to get additional information from their doctor. [REDACTED] explained that [REDACTED] has been trying to resolve this since the beginning of the school year, and this has been very stressful for [REDACTED].</p> <p>SGS asked [REDACTED] to sign a waiver which would allow DRS to provide EOO with additional information regarding their disability and accommodation. [REDACTED] then signed the waiver. SGS explained to [REDACTED] that SGS and LB would meet with [REDACTED] again, and follow-up with [REDACTED].</p>
5/15/18	SGS and LB meet with [REDACTED]	<p>[REDACTED] explained that he feels the general “flexibility” accommodation that had been used, not just for [REDACTED], but other DRS Students, was too broad and could not be effectively implemented by professors. New to the DRS, [REDACTED] is reviewing and enhancing accommodation language that he feels will be clearer and will be able to be more effectively implemented by professors. [REDACTED] was one of other students affected by this change.</p>
6/5/18	LB, [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]	<p>[REDACTED] explained why [REDACTED]’s original accommodation was changed, and he explained why the new accommodation [REDACTED] emailed to him was not appropriate. He told [REDACTED] that he wanted to work them to develop accommodations would work effectively for each class.</p> <p>[REDACTED] asked [REDACTED] questions about their [REDACTED]. And [REDACTED] answered [REDACTED] questions. [REDACTED] indicated that the accommodation language they sent to [REDACTED] would work very well for them. [REDACTED] explained that long reading assignments trigger their [REDACTED] and the five day extension on assignments would allow [REDACTED] to complete their assignments timely.</p> <p>After [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] talked for about 20 minutes. LB indicated that the time scheduled for the meeting was about to expire.</p>
		<p>Continued conversation with [REDACTED] who continues to feel [REDACTED] original accommodation was too general to be effectively implemented. He said it would be good for [REDACTED] to check in</p>

		each quarter so that [REDACTED] needs, per a particular class, could be assessed and an appropriate accommodation determined.
6/29/18	SGS t/c with [REDACTED]	Reviews discussions she and LB have had with [REDACTED] who explained being new to the DRS office, he was reviewing accommodations to ensure they were clear and able to be effectively implemented by professors and that "flexibility," an accommodation previously provided to students was too general to be effectively implemented. [REDACTED] also feels that "long term assignment" as an accommodation was also ambiguous. Since this general accommodation was changed across the board, [REDACTED] accommodation was also changed. [REDACTED] is very open to working with [REDACTED] on each of [REDACTED] classes and assignments to determine what was needed and what was appropriate. Discussed difficulty of having to check in on every class every quarter with DRS and DRS process.
7/9/18	SGS t/c with [REDACTED]	Relayed conversation with [REDACTED] to [REDACTED]; SGS. [REDACTED] continues to feel that [REDACTED] previously worded accommodation is too broad and does not feel he can adopt [REDACTED] suggested wording for their accommodation as every class and assignment presents a different issue. He is open to [REDACTED] reaching out to him and is happy to continue to work with [REDACTED] on this.
7/13/19	SGS t/c [REDACTED]	SGS and [REDACTED] further discusses [REDACTED] recommended accommodation language and SGS requests a copy [REDACTED] sends SGS a copy of the proposed language.
8/28 and 8/29	[REDACTED] email to SGS and SGS response	[REDACTED] asks for update on accommodation issue and SGS indicates provides update. There is still no resolution to adopting more expansive and clarifying wording that [REDACTED] is recommending.
9/11-9/14	EOO sets up meeting for [REDACTED] (support person), SGS and DB	SGS feels that a meeting with DB, Director, DRS may be able to produce a resolution more responsive to [REDACTED] concern about their accommodation, given that DB has history regarding [REDACTED] accommodation. Hailey Chittick, EO Administrative Assistant sets up this meeting.
9/17/18	SGS meets with [REDACTED], and David Brunnemer (DB)	Discussion results in DB willingness to write up an accommodation for [REDACTED] professors that expands, personalizes and clarifies [REDACTED] accommodation needs for each of [REDACTED] classes and to each of [REDACTED] professors.
9/28/18	[REDACTED] leaves voicemail for SGS	[REDACTED] voice message said that there was no ability to enter text on the My DRS website they went into and could not accomplish this. Needs clarification.
9/30/18	SGS emails [REDACTED]	Sorry was not available Friday to take your call but please call Monday and will give you an update.
9/30/18	SGS emails David Brunnemer	Informs DB about [REDACTED] call and difficulty getting onto the My DRS site. DB clarifies that [REDACTED] doesn't have to do anything else, that their professors have been notified.

10/1/18	David Emails SGS	Indicates [REDACTED] doesn't need to do anything on the DRS website and that he has communicated the accommodation to each of [REDACTED] professors and their accommodation with expanded explanation and clarification is provided to them.
10/2/18	SGS t/c with [REDACTED]	SGS relates this information (see above) to [REDACTED]
1/7/19	[REDACTED] emails Kim Thiessen and copies DB and SGS	[REDACTED] inquires about the accommodation David provided, with expanded language and asks if this will be the standard procedure for the rest of [REDACTED] time at Western.
1/11/19	[REDACTED] sends clarification email to [REDACTED] copies SGS & DB	In Kim's absence, [REDACTED] clarifies to [REDACTED] that "The language you, Sue and David agreed to was on your letters to faculty this quarter, and will remain on them." He then provides the full text of this.